DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 225 263 EA 015 291

AUTHOR Emory, Ruth
TITLE Institutionalization: How Can We Continue Good Practices and Functions When Funding Ends? Part II.
INSTITUTION Northwest Regional Educational Lab., Portland, Oreg.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 1 Oct 81
CONTRACT 400-80-0105
NOTE 45p.; Prepared for the Northwest Regional Exchange Advisory Board. One chart may not reproduce due to small print of original document. For a related document, see EA 015 290.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; Adoption (Ideas); Educational Change; Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; Financial Support; *Government Role; *Information Dissemination; Information Utilization; Postsecondary Education; *State Government; Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS *Institutionalization (of Innovations)

ABSTRACT

Based on the conference for which the related document (EA 015 290) was prepared, this document reports the discussions and results of the meeting of the Northwest Regional Exchange (NWRx) Advisory Board with its staff and several consultants on the problem of how to institutionalize dissemination functions in the region's states--that is, how to incorporate state dissemination plans and programs into a state's ongoing business. Chapter 1 of the report covers the discussions of four classes of issues: (1) working with organizations toward institutionalization of dissemination plans, (2) continuing efforts to institutionalize particular dissemination projects, (3) funding and marketing problems related to institutionalization, and (4) role taking by administrators and agencies in the institutionalization of dissemination plans. For each class of issue, the report presents related hypotheses from EA 015 290, hypotheses generated by the discussions, and related ideas from a conference talk by Adrianne Banks. Chapter 2 summarizes the statements by NWRx member states on what each will do after the conference. A matrix for planning for institutionalization is given in chapter 3. Three appendices provide the text of Banks' talk, notes from conference discussion groups, and a clarification of the terms "permanent systems" and "temporary systems". (Author/RW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED225263

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. Margaret Rogers
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

INSTITUTIONALIZATION: How Can We Continue Good Practices and Functions When Funding Ends?

Part II

Prepared by Ruth Emory
for the
Northwest Regional Exchange Advisory Board

October 1, 1981

Dissemination Field Services
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
300 Southwest Sixth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204

EA 015 291

INSTITUTIONALIZATION: How Can We Continue Good Practices and Functions When Funding Ends?

Part II

Prepared by Ruth Emory
for the
Northwest Regional Exchange Advisory Board

October 1, 1981

Dissemination Field Services
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
300 Southwest Sixth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204

The work upon which this publication is based was performed pursuant to Contract No. 400-800-0105 of the National Institute of Education. It does not, however, necessarily reflect the views of that agency.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....1

CHAPTER I - A DIALOGUE ABOUT ISSUES OF INSTITUTIONALIZATION.....5

CHAPTER II - AS A RESULT OF THE DIALOGUE.....17

CHAPTER III - WHEN PLANNING FOR INSTITUTIONALIZATION.....21

APPENDICES

A - Text of Remarks Made By Dr. Adrianne Banks.....29

B - Notes from reports of group meetings.....39

C - Clarification of some terms as requested by some members of the Advisory Board.....49

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

When the Advisory Board of the Northwest Regional Exchange met on October 20 its purpose was to consider the implications of a synthesis of information on institutionalization for the dissemination function in the states of the region. The NWREL was included in the conversation, rather like a seventh state for the region. The outcome sought for was an assessment and analysis of movement toward incorporation of state dissemination plans and projects into the ongoing business of the states as a "regular" function.

Members of the Board had copies of the synthesis in hand, which, along with observations of Dr. Adrianne Bank, of CSE. formed the basis for a series of discussions and reports. This document is a synthesis of the findings the group produced.

Generally, members of the Board agreed with the hypotheses stated in the synthesis report and found the report to be a stimulus toward problem solving in their own states. Time constraints precluded a discussion of all issues raised by the group. An observer would probably expect that discussion and clarification will continue in the states in the coming weeks and months. In fact, the report, discussions, and beginning action planning will continue as NWRx staff and the states continue their work.

CHAPTER I
A DIALOGUE ABOUT ISSUES OF INSTITUTIONALIZATION

CHAPTER I - A DIALOGUE ABOUT ISSUES OF INSTITUTIONALIZATION

The procedures used during the study were designed to involve the members of the Board in an interaction with the synthesis document, each other, and with the consultant, Dr. Adrianne Bank. At times the analysis and assessment gave way to the beginning stages of problem solving, which helped participants deal directly with personal concerns. The process of assessment of the "state of the states" in the institutionalization of the dissemination function may have been hindered as problem solving activities emerged in the discussions.

An examination of the resulting issues seem to organize into four classes of issues:

1. Working with the organization toward institutionalization of dissemination plans.

2. Continuing efforts to institutionalize particular dissemination projects (routinizing a practice or innovation).

3. Funding and marketing concerns related to institutionalizing dissemination plans and projects.

4. Role taking in the institutionalization of dissemination plans and projects.

In this chapter hypotheses as stated in the synthesis, Part I, additional hypothesis generated by the Board issues and questions raised by the Board, and remarks made by Dr. Bank have been sorted into each of the classes of issues.

CLASS I

WORKING WITH THE ORGANIZATION TOWARD INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF DISSEMINATION PLANS.

Related Hypotheses

1. Institutionalization of projects and functions is unlikely if routinization and incorporation of the project or function are not explicitly made a part of the planning process from the outset, including plans for seeking additional funding for continuation goals.

2. Success in the institutionalization of new practices is related to where the project is located administratively. Projects placed in planning and research divisions are facilitated during planning, mobilization and implementation phases. The institutionalization stage is more likely to occur if the project is housed in a service division.

3. Active involvement of administrators at all levels in the system (particularly top administrators) in all phases of the development of a project (including institutionalization) is critical for eventual incorporation into the system.

4. A change in the political environment or a reduction or loss in funding may block institutionalization or cause the project or function to regress to previous practices.

Hypothesis Generated By Regional Exchange Board

Leadership doesn't need to be sold on the innovation in the early stages, but does need to provide the supportive climate which will allow a fair test of the innovations.

Related Questions And Issues From Small Group Work

1. There is a need for linkage between decision makers and implementers.

2. If leadership needs to provide a supportive climate to allow a fair test of the innovation we need to provide for an objective decision to be reached regarding leadership support.

3. We need to identify specific ways key administrators can behave to support institutionalization.

4. What about the changing roles and functions of SEA/LEA project people when dissemination is no longer a federally guided, monitoring function?

5. We need to identify the roles/norms that have emerged since inception of ESEA Title Funding in 1965, as well as identify new roles/norms emerging in 1981 political climate.

Questions Raised in a General Session

1. How can I influence the Board of Education into accepting an idea?

2. What can I do to bring about a supportive climate? The CSSO does it--what influence can I have? How can I be encouraging?

3. How can I react to the inaction regarding lack of clarity about block grants and the role of the agency?

4. How can we (NWREL Dissemination Unit) couple our implicit function as a Dissemination Unit with implicit dissemination functions of every program in the Lab?

5. How do I identify and get the kinds of key leadership support needed in the 6 states and NWREL.

6. How can collaboration among agencies in the service of institutionalizing the dissemination function be improved?

7. Once we institutionalize--does that mean it's there forever? Issue - the terminus of institutionalization--is "fading out" good enough?

Related Ideas From Bank's Remarks

Virtually all of Dr. Bank's remarks are related to this issue, either directly or by implication. The reader is urged to read the text of her remarks in Appendix A with great care. Here are a few highlights which seem particularly related to the issue:

- Guidelines provided and evidence accumulated need to be viewed situationally. Look for the basic truth and apply it to the particular situation. Develop state or local hypotheses and test them.

- Understand the organization. Applying a specific guideline from another organizational context amounts to a "force-fit" and has an excellent chance of being unsuccessful.

- Be clear about the political nature of institutionalization. Pay attention to lobby groups, building constituencies, building coalitions, negotiating, identifying power bases.

- Be aware of societal preferences and use them as a handle to interpret and reinterpret routinization efforts.

- In each organization individuals are operating on different wave lengths. Know the setting and how to tap in on differing ways of viewing and valuing the world.

- If there is no idea champion ("care-clout factor") at the top of the organization, work to get one.

- Organizational movement is not necessarily logical or rational and seldom moves according to plan.

- Coordinating mechanisms are ways in which the organization uses new programs and move to train and support people and routinize new programs. They may be informal or formal. What they are is not as important as that they serve the purposes of communication and inspiration.

Class II

CONTINUING EFFORTS TO INSTITUTIONALIZE PARTICULAR DISSEMINATION PROJECTS (ROUTINIZING A PRACTICE OR INNOVATION).

Related Hypotheses

1. Institutionalization is more likely when the innovation or function has a diverse and broad base of support and is responsive to the situation by being both flexible and adaptable.

2. Institutionalization is facilitated by early and frequent informal contact with influencers and image makers and by extensive public presentations about the project by persons directly involved in its development.

3. The kind and quality of leadership for the project is critical for its success. Loss or change of leadership endangers the prospects for institutionalization.

4. Institutionalization is blocked if the project or function is perceived as being significantly different from current practice or as being based on norms and values which are incongruent with the system.

5. Institutionalization is more likely and is enhanced when practitioners are provided thorough and continuous training in the new practice or function.

Hypotheses Generated by Regional Exchange Board

1. There is greater potential for institutionalization if the innovation fills a vacuum, addresses a need or provides a service not in competition with an existing program.

2. Maintenance of separate, visible projects is contrary to potential for institutionalization.

Related Questions and Issues From Small Group Work

1. What do we do about identifying and latching on to existing practices or components when introducing innovations and/or change programs?

2. What are some ways in which cost sharing on the part of the client can occur to enhance institutionalization?

3. What is the effect of NIE's limited expectations of SEAs (staff, line organization and thinking/support) when real change takes place.

Need for More Clarification and Discussion

1. Clarify temporary--permanent systems

   - What are factors working on a temporary system?
   - How do you recognize the stages of transition from temporary to permanent status?

2. How can you get a broad base of support when you have to be both flexible and adaptable? How do you maintain trust level and credibility?

3. What does it take to be flexible?

4. Next to last statement in list on page 10--who is doing it? ("Implication--that the SEA could play a much greater role in bringing about change throughout the state if it chose to plan and promote change systematically. Given the tinusus nature of federal funding and years of experiences with temporary programs, it might be timely to begin such efforts in areas where they have not already begun. Widmer, 1975.")

5. What about the apparent conflict between flexibility and credibility?

Questions Raised in General Session

1. How do I "firm up" a loose communication network of linkers that exist in the state (step to formalizing, cohesion, more life).

2. How do I continue to try to instill a proactive service mode of operation as opposed to a reactive, regulatory mode.

3. How can we show evidence of the institutionalization of the Dissemination Unit within NWREL projects?

4. How can I become credible so that people can ask for help? How to institutionalize a process of giving and receiving help that is open and credible and business-like?

Related Ideas From Bank's Remarks

As was the case in the first issue, Dr. Bank was a rich resource with ideas related to the issue. It is a temptation simply to reproduce the text here. However, a few highlights may serve to indicate some of the relatedness:

- The most useful people in the organization are those who value, have the capacity for, and willingness to learn new skills. This idea supports the notion of viewing knowledge and skills situationally and dynamically, rather than in a linear, static mode.

- Grass roots support is crucial. Strategize about how to mobilize it and translate it into notes.

- In each community the configuration of events is different. Work to understand these differences and use them.

- Idea champions can sense support, mobilize support, reconceptualize previous actions so that people can see the desired action as a logical extension of what is already happening in the organization.

- People act and react, making sense out of what they are doing later.

- Coordinating mechanisms are ways in which organizations use new programs, train and support people in them. Sometimes they are highly centralized. Sometimes they are decentralized with the central office making sure they happen, but not participating in or dictating what should happen.

- Impact on the task (intended outcome) is often less important than that on peripheral areas, e.g. on attitudes and feelings of people involved, on social arrangements, on media, on the community and parents. It is important to define impact broadly as both product and process.

Class III

FUNDING AND MARKETING CONCERNS RELATED TO INSTITUTIONALIZING DISSEMINATION PLANS AND PROJECTS.

Related Hypotheses

1. Institutionalization of projects and functions is unikely if routinization and incorporation of the project or function are not explicitly made a part of the planning process from the outset, including plans for seeking additional funding for continuation goals.

2. Active involvement of administrators at all levels in the system (particularly top administrators) in all phases of the development of a project (including institutionalization) is critical for eventual incorporation into the system.

3. Institutionalization is facilitated by early and frequent informal contact with influencers and image makers and by extensive public presentations about the project by persons directly involved in its development.

4. Institutionalization is blocked if the project or function is perceived as being significantly different from current practice or as being based on norms and values which are incongruent with the system.

Hypothesis Generated by Regional Exchange Board

Utilization of externally provided resources as support for moving the organization/school in the direction desired will enhance the potential for institutionalization.

Related Questions and Issues From Small Group Work

1. What are some ways in which cost sharing on the part of the client can occur to enhance institutionalization?

Questions Raised in General Session

1. How can I assure state funding for what we are currently doing with NIE/NDN funds (HEDDS).

2. How can I react to the inaction--lack of clarity about block grants and the role of the agency?

3. How can concepts of Marketing can be applied positively to dissemination activities, efforts, strategies?

Related Ideas From Bank's Remarks

Dr. Bank did not address herself as directly to this issue as to the first two. However, she did have one or two ideas relating clearly to the issue, while other remarks have implications for the issues. Here are some of the ideas:

- Be creative and inventive about funding needs. Instead of retrenching when government (or other external) funding dries up think of other ways to secure funding. Consider the private sector. Involve business in the business of schooling.

- Develop marketing and advertising strategies. Remember that while knowledge is power, it does need and deserve the best packaging we can give it. Learn to understand your audiences as advertisers understand theirs and let that understanding influence what you do and say and how you do and say it. This is true internally as well as externally. Either get the skills or hire consultants who have the skills.

- Coordinating mechanisms are ways in which organizations... support [people]. There are two major purposes of coordinating mechanisms: one, an exchange of information; two, exchange of points of view, perspectives, enthusiasms.

- Impact on the task (intended outcomes) is often less important than that on peripheral areas, e.g. on attitudes and feelings of people involved, on social arrangements, on media, on the community, and on the parents.

Class IV

ROLE TAKING IN THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF DISSEMINATION PLANS AND PROJECTS.

Related Hypotheses

1. Active involvement of administrators at all levels in the system (particularly top administrators) in all phases of a project (including institutionalization) is critical for eventual incorporation into the system.

2. The kind and quality of leadership for the project is critical for its success. Loss or change of leadership endangers the prospects for institutionalization.

Related Issues and Questions From Small Group Work

1. What about the changing roles and functions of SEA/LEA project people when dissemination is no longer a federally guided, monitoring function?

2. There is a need to identify the roles/norms that have emerged since the inception of ESEA Title Funding in 1965, as well as to identify new roles and norms which are emerging in the political climate of 1981.

Related Ideas From Bank's Remarks

There is very little in Dr. Bank's remarks which relates directly to this issue. The issue was not addressed directly during any part of the meeting. However, the way people take roles--what is expected of them in the organization--is important as dissemination plans move toward institutionalization.

Some clues which may lead to relatedness are found in some of Dr. Bank's remarks, as follows:

- Individuals apecate on different wave-lengths according to many factors in their backgrounds, including the years during which they were in public school. This causes them to view and value the world in different ways.

- The idea champion is someone who cares and possesses the clout to make things happen (the "care-clout factor"). They care enough to pay attention to details of coalition building, negotiating, trading favors to make it happen.

- There is not something (as we abstract organizations) that can be identified clearly as a planning process, or an implementation

process, or an institutionalization process. These things often go on simultaneously at many levels, implicitly as well as explicitly. Understanding these obvious and subtle elements is very important.

- The most useful people in an organization are those who value, have the capacity for, and willingness to learn new skills.

CHAPTER II
AS A RESULT OF THE DIALOGUE ..

CHAPTER II - AS A RESULT OF THE DIALOGUE...

After studying the synthesis document, raising questions and issues, and after hearing and conversing with Adrianne Bank the members of the Advisory Board started the process of deriving implications from their study which will lead to action in the direction of incorporating state dissemination plans and projects into ongoing state functions. Generally, the synthesis document and resulting study and conversation will be used as basic tools for similar study and assessment in the states. Implications of the study for NWREL are generally stated in terms that set conditions for institutionalization, from which some possible action steps can be inferred.

Here are the statements made following a work session to begin the action planning process:

Alaska: will negotiate with the Regional Exchange to use the synthesis as a tool to study its redirection process, document the ongoing history of the process, record what has been happening and develop a case study report.

Hawaii (HEDDS): will work with the Regional Exchange, using the synthesis and the matrix presented in Planning for Institutionalization, Pankratz, et al. as tools to study the Principal's Project (Hawaii District),

will make the synthesis available to the Office of Instructional Services for the purpose of study to derive implications, and

will use the document as a tool to assess the extent to which NDN projects installed in various schools have been institutionalized.

Oregon: will implement ideas received for strengthening Oregon's linkers network,

will focus on securing fiscal support for dissemination activities (which are now included as a legitimate activity of the department), and

will prepare and distribute a summary of the synthesis

Washington: will re-assess dissemination activities in light of synthesis

Northern Marianas Islands:

will work with the Regional Exchange, using the synthesis and the matrix presented in Planning for Institutionalization, Pankratz, et al as tools to document approaches to Math, Science and Language Arts Curriculum, and

will work with the Regional Exchange to use the synthesis as a training tool with the Central Office of Curriculum Administration.

NOTE: The states of Idaho and Montana are not included in the list above. The person substituting for the representative from the state of Idaho did not have the information needed to derive action steps. The representative from Montana was unable to attend the meeting. However, the synthesis document and this report will become the basis for on-site planning in those states.

The NWREL "state", as indicated, presented implications in the form of conditions required for the dissemination function to be institutionalized within the laboratory. Here is the list generated by that group:

A. Implications for individuals in NWREL Dissemination Services unit if it is to become institutionalized

1. Personal and group identity will change
2. Rewards will be more intrinsic, less extrinsic
3. Potential for long-term employment is increased

B. Implications for the NWREL Dissemination Services as a whole (as a group) if it is to become institutionalized

1. It will be more convergent with organizational (NWREL) values
2. Members of the unit will work more with NWREL staff than at or on staff
3. Members of the unit will be viewed by the organization (staff of NWREL) as useful to them
4. What members of the unit do will match other's expectations of what the function(s) of the unit should be
5. Institutionalization of the unit has the potential of either increasing or decreasing use of the dissemination unit's services.

The process of deriving implications from the study and translating them into action plans will continue as the states and NWRx staff continue their planning activities in the weeks ahead.

CHAPTER III
WHEN PLANNING FOR INSTITUTIONALIZATION

CHAPTER III - WHEN PLANNING FOR INSTITUTIONALIZATION

The conversation during the session made it clear that eventual incorporation of a plan or practice into the mainstream of an agency requires more attention than good planning for the innovation itself, as important and thorough as such planning must be. The eventual institutionalization of an innovation requires, as Dr. Bank pointed out, attention to a significant number of additional factors. These included factors surrounding relevant environments, the presence and/or generation of idea champions, the presence of facilitative coordination mechanisms and a broadly defined understanding of impact.

One way of organizing these, and other, factors into a useful form is to utilize the matrix developed in Planning for Institutionalization: The Continuation of New Programs and Practices (Pankratz, et al.) to provide a set of checklist-type questions for planners. The matrix attends to both the goal of institutionalization (stages of institutionalization) and the process of institutionalization (facilitative events). The matrix as displayed in Pankratz is reproduced here, along with a utilization of it to help planners.

Table

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE STAGES OF INSTITUTIONALIZATION AND THE SEVEN FACILITATIVE ACTIVITIES

Facilitative Activities	Stages of Institutionalization				
	Awareness	Acceptance	Preparation	Limited Installation	Institution-alization
Defining Program or Practice	X	X	X		
Judging Institutional Potential		X	X	X	
Planning an Overall Strategy		X	X	X	X
Identifying Critical Events	X	X	X	X	X
Planning Strategic Actions	X	X	X	X	X
Documenting Strategic Actions	X	X	X	X	X
Verification of Change				X	X

from Pankratz, et al. Planning for Institutionalization: The Continuation of New Programs and Practices

STAGES OF INSTITUTIONALIZATION

FACILITATIVE ACTIVITIES	AWARENESS	ACCEPTANCE	PREPARATION	LIMITED INSTALLATION	INSTITUTIONALIZATION
In what ways is the plan or practice being defined?	How is awareness of the intent of the plan or practice being generated?	What means are being used to gain acceptance of the way the plan or practice is understood?	How are various audiences being prepared to participate in the definition of the plan or practice?		
How are judgments being made about the potential the plan or practice being considered has in the institution?		What does the level of acceptance of the plan or practice indicate about potential?	How does the ease--or lack of ease--with which preparations are made provide clues for potential?	What does a "try-out" of the plan or practice indicate for incorporation potential?	
What is included in the overall strategies to ensure routinization of the plan or practice?		What strategies are in place to gain acceptance?	What strategies are planned for the initiation of the plan or practice?	What plans are in place during the initial installation which will help eventual incorporation?	What will be done during the time when decisions whether to incorporate are taken?
What energy is being put into identifying critical events (those events which provide "go-no go" decisions) in the incorporation of the plan or practice in all stages of institutionalization?					
What plans are being made for strategic action to be taken in all stages of planning for institutionalization to be responsive to critical events, thereby insuring that various forces which may influence the process are taken into account?					
How will the strategic actions planned at all stages of the process be documented?					
What means are being planned which will lead to verification of the change being sought by the plan or practice?				What verification of the sought-after change can be seen in the limited installation of the plan or program?	What verification of the sought-after change can be validated by the final plan or practice as it is incorporated into the system?

adapted from Pankratz, et al. Planning for Institutionalization: The Continuation of New Programs and Practices

APPENDIX A

DR. ADRIANNE BANK'S REMARKS

APPENDIX A

DR. ADRIANNE BANK'S REMARKS

Introduction

Looking at dissemination projects that have become institutionalized or dissemination situations that are already finished provides one set of insights. Constructively going forward with institutionalization probably depends upon an additional set of insights, plus some other kinds of understandings.

Public education is in a crisis period. The educational scene as we have known it for the last 15 or 18 years is changing. School districts are in turmoil, schools are in turmoil, parents are in turmoil. Massive population changes within school districts are causing the closing of some schools, opening of other schools, consolidation of schools. There are the incredible stresses related to funding and a feeling that schools, as well as some industries in the United States, are in a condition of decline rather than in the condition of growth which has, till now characterized the economy.

Then, there is the increase in immigrant minority populations, with accompanying problems of different aculturation patterns and different needs for services to be provided by the schools. There is the social change associated with the women's movement and the new fact that women form an enormous part of the work force. From this problems arise; children may not have somebody at home to go to in the afternoon; mothers may not be as involved in schools as a volunteer or on a staff basis as they've been before.

These massive societal changes are impacting schools. The impact is transmitted through court orders in relation to desegregation, in the changing federal involvement in education with funding through block grants rather than categorical programs; in the generally acknowledged diminution of public confidence in public schools. The public school appears to be losing its middle class support base.

All of these factors are very important to consider when we, as professionals, direct our efforts toward the improvement of education in the 1980's.

Somewhere I read that the Chinese character for crisis consists of two signs--one for opportunity and one for danger. It seems to me that we are in a crisis. We do have opportunities. There are danger areas, especially for the kinds of things that we have been interested in for the past 15 years. We are at a point where we need better to understand ourselves and our own perspectives and what we want in mission-oriented--I would like to put it more accurately--in a vision-oriented way.

(Missions and Organizational mission statements get made up for a variety of reasons but visions are more encompassing and have to do with images and ideas and notions about the real direction we hope to go). We have to understand ourselves, our own institutions and what is going on in the country today, before we can renew our approach to the problem of what we do that will result in improved education.

Recently, I was in Austin, Texas at a joint conference of the Evaluation Network and the Evaluation Research Society. In these meetings we were trying to come together to produce more clout for evaluation within the educational community. Austin seemed a fitting place for the meeting to be, because it was in fact a re-examination of the field of evaluation which is, as is the field of dissemination, in some ways a federal artifact. Both fields came about through federal involvement and attention to education that accelerated with Lyndon Johnson's Great Society program. It seemed fitting that the epitaph for this stage was being articulated in Austin. The theme of this year's conference was "Utilization", which seems to me to be another perception on institutionalization. The theme for next year is "Retrenchment" or "What Happens When Institutionalization Fails."

Like the educators, disseminators must realize that our 15 years of professional life in this field have given us some unique perspectives and points of view. We have to re-examine them now, and apply to ourselves the things that we've been talking about to other people--namely notions of change, individual learning, reconceptualizations--so as to understand the anxieties and stresses and concerns that we all feel at some very basic levels--such as job insecurity, personal burn-out, stress and so forth. How do we make meaning out of our work during the past 15 years? How do we make sense of the work of our own organizations and what we would like them to do? I would like to make a few remarks within the general context I've just described.

Three Kinds of Awareness

In my work at the Center for the Study of Evaluation with school districts and with the National Diffusion Network in trying to understand how evaluation can become part of our organizational renewal process, I have become aware of three things. First I have come to believe that theory and research can tell us some things and our informed common sense can tell us other things. We certainly must develop generic guidelines and principles and conceptualizations. However, organizations are specific to the situation and to the time and to the individuals working in them. All of the information we collect serves as input to us, but they should not be prescriptive for us. For example, I found the hypotheses in the synthesis prepared by Ruth Emory very useful as stimulators of ideas but I'm not sure that they should be accepted as "the law" or that they are true on a one-to-one basis every time, in every organizational setting. Organizations have histories, settings, people and systems that make them unique. What we need is an intelligent application of the hypotheses, and other research to the specific organizational setting; we should not expect a kind of one-to-one correspondence between research and practice.

Secondly, I've become aware that things don't work in school districts or other educational organizations the way we abstract them. For example, there is not something that can be identified clearly as a "planning process" or an "implementation process" or an "institutionalization process" when people do their jobs day by day. These processes often go on simultaneously at many levels. They often occur implicitly as well as explicitly, informally as well as formally. Recognizing all of the subtle as well as obvious elements is necessary. To understand that they exist is of first importance. Then understanding how to maneuver with them is also very important and very difficult.

More specific to my work, and to your concerns here today, is the third thing I have come to realize. Often the people who are most useful in educational organizations are those who have a very broad range of skills, who are able to understand where particular skills are needed and can learn these new sets of skills. For example, the evaluation community is learning very quickly that evaluators cannot be really useful to school people unless they also understand something about curriculum; about power dynamics within the organization; about how teachers feel and how unions operate; and about the community groups who have to be mobilized or appeased or brought into some sort of consensus. These are knowledges and skills which are quite different from what is included in the training graduate schools give to students about how to draw up controlled experiments. I'm sure the same observation applies to disseminators in educational settings. That is, the set of skills that you come with are enhanced when you add on an overlay of other skills.

If we are in the future going to be problem-oriented and solution-inventive, we need to expand our knowledges, our skills, and our horizons, so I'm making the case for an ecumenical approach to school improvement. In looking at our school districts (and I assume this may be the case in looking at your state departments of education) we found four constructs or concepts to be of use in understanding institutional dynamics relating to evaluation. I would like to present our understanding of those concepts and pull from them ideas that seem to apply to dissemination and invite you to do the same thing.

Four Useful Constructs

The first construct is the notion of "relevant environments". The second is the notion of idea champions. The third is the idea of coordinating mechanisms and the fourth of impact. They do not scale in any particular kind of way, although at CSE we have developed elaborate graphics to indicate how they might relate to one another, but that is not what is important. What is important is that here are categories within which to place some interesting ideas.

Relevant Environments

Among the relevant environments that impact on organizations--schools, LEAs and SEAs all being organizations--are those that are societal in nature. For instance, there are trends in our country now, including ideas such as back to basics, accountability, productivity, general dislike of terms such as innovation, change and

general liking for terms such as achievement, productivity, management. Societal preferences come from the federal government, they come from media, they come from general swings in our perceptions of what is wrong with our country and what is right with our country. These trends are important to notice as they manifest environment of educational institutions because they give us the language through which we can reinterpret our work so that people can understand what we're doing and can accept what we are doing and regard what we are doing as important. Knowing what the societal preferences are at the moment is critical in understanding how we might work more effectively.

Relevant environments also include the immediate community to which state educational agencies or the local educational agency is responsive. Each state and each district is different. I have been several weeks in each of six districts and have found that the configurations of attitudes and ideas are quite different from place to place. In one there was a clear political split within the community with the conservative and a progressive faction mirrored on the school board. In another place, all was quiet and agreeable; the district is running what amounts to a private school system. Everybody is upper middle class and college oriented. These are entirely different contexts within which school districts operate. A third district has 58 language groups within its schools and is trying to cope with how to educate these children and how to acculturate them and their parents. Another school district is operating with ethnic pockets throughout its city. Groups are ghettoizing themselves so each school is, in effect, a separate entity which has a different constituency. It seems clear to me that the community and the immediate environment around the organization is as important to understand as are the larger societal trends.

A third set of "relevant environments" are the set of individuals currently within any organization. I was interested in Ruth's comment about people being a product of the year in which they graduated school; we are all products of our basic learnings and our basic perceptions and our basic orientations to the world and one can probably sort us on rough generational lines. We need to be aware within our organization of who is on what wavelength. You may have to deal with the superintendent who is a 1930s person in a way different than you have to deal with teachers who might be 1950s types. We should note that this typology is not the only useful way to sort people. It helps to know an array of alternative dimensions. At the Austin conference there was talk about internal and external locus of control and how people who sort on that dimension use evaluation information differently. Knowing such things about how individuals in an organizational setting create their environment and how that environment then ripples back to effect their work is essential. Thus, there are sets of relevant environments--societal, community and intraorganizational--which impact upon whatever unit is being considered.

Idea Champions

A second category that started to emerge from our study of school districts of the NDN this morning was that of "idea champions" and supporters. (In one of the groups that I listened to somebody talked about needs assessments and how they operate to rationalize getting funds from various sources. He pointed out that needs assessments are often "manufactured"). It seems to me that this is probably a rational thing for leaders to do when they are constructing a justification for doing what they think has to be done, but are doing it in the terms that are laid out for them by regulations and by people who are somewhere other than in their organization.

We observed, and certainly not with great originality, that the way things happen is that somebody who cares and who possesses the clout makes things happen in an organization. We call that the "care/clout factor". The "clout" didn't have to be necessarily at the top. There are many people who can influence from the side. They are masters at organizing coalitions and in understanding how wielders of power within that organization work. For example, we found an assistant superintendent of curriculum who had a strong alliance with the president of the school board. The two were golfing partners. The school board elections put the superintendent of curriculum's friend on the school board. The school board then elected him as president. Their friendship and their combined powers moved that district in the direction of fundamental schools. These two people (with no formal needs assessment) tapped into concerns of the community that the kids were not achieving well enough; that there was too much vandalism and not enough respect; that dress codes had gotten out of hand. They were able to mobilize those general feelings within the community and--without any research data, without any notion of how fundamental schools were really going to operate--use those feelings to influence the district's five-year plan. Those people are idea-champions--they knew what they wanted, they knew how they wanted to get it, they cared enough to pay attention to all the details of coalition building and negotiation and trading favors with one another to make it happen.

Often the people who care are up top and that's helpful. However, if the people who are at the top don't care about what you as a disseminator want to do, there is a natural corrolary to this "care/clout factor". Either you have to get to them and make them care about what you want to do or you yourself must become a powerful "idea champion". Idea champions, in any organization, know how to mobilize support and enthusiasm to move the organization toward some goal.

What idea champions seem to do is sense support, articulate that support, reconceptualize previous actions so they can make the case that the organization had been moving in that direction all along or that the organization already has a basis for moving in that direction. We all are familiar with the fact that when you write proposals you create "institutional bait". That is, you pick and choose what your organization has been doing in such a way that it makes the case that you are indeed the people to be funded. Idea champions are able to move their organization in a given direction and to reconceptualize the past

so that people perceive the direction as a very logical one. The direction was not necessarily logical to begin with. That is, the organization didn't necessarily move according to a prespecified plan--people move on a broken front. People do things--they do their jobs, they pick up opportunities from the environment, they act and they react--and only later do they make sense out of what they have done. Organizations rarely function deductively--set a goal and then plan activities to reach the goal.

After I noticed this in the six school districts we were studying, I chuckled because I then noticed the same thing about my own organization. For 5 or 6 years, I was the Associate Director of the Center and we had spent a lot of time trying to make it move in a rational direction. But, the Center rarely moved in a single, coherent direction. When we had to justify our existence to NIE, we did it one way; when we justified our existence to clients, we did it in different terms; when we justified our existence to ourselves, we did it a third way. Understanding this, if it turns out to be true for your organization from your experience, will help you figure how you institutionalize what you are doing in dissemination.

Coordinating Mechanisms

"Coordinating mechanisms" is another holding category for us. In our districts we were looking for ways in which management had linked testing or evaluation with instruction. We found that there were a variety of coordinating mechanisms and they differed from district to district, depending on the size of district, depending on the environmental climate, depending upon the history of the organization, and depending on philosophy of the people on the top.

In some districts, the organization chart revealed nothing about how things really happened. That is, people would go down the hall to the men's room or the women's room and, in that corridor conversation, three or four week's worth of activities would be planned. Things sometimes got coordinated as people moved around in organization and maintained their friendship alliances with one another. In other districts, there were quite formal mechanisms; committees were set up, memos were written, there were newsletters, there were ad hoc groups, there were presentations. The range of coordinating mechanisms is quite large.

Regardless of what the mechanisms themselves were, they had to serve certain purposes in order to be effective. One of the purposes was clearly communication, another purpose was clearly inspirational. In other words, they served as the mobilizing vehicles for the idea champions. That is, they were not only ways to exchange information, they were ways of exchanging points of view and perspectives and enthusiasm. In some districts the coordinating mechanisms came from the top, and were highly centralized. In other districts they were quite decentralized and the role of the central office was to make sure that they happened, but not to participate in or dictate what was to go on.

Impact

The last category, which I just want to sketch out to you, has to do with impact. We were concerned with impact because the impact of an evaluation on a program is a traditional way to define the use of evaluation. What we found was that impact of evaluation, or for that matter any other function, such as dissemination, cannot be identified unless the intentions of the policy-making organization are known. We became unable to think about impact in the abstract nor could we think about it only in terms of announced intentions. That is, unanticipated impacts are often more important than anticipated or intended impacts. For example, the impact on specified task was often less relevant than the impact on peripheral areas. Peripheral impact refers to: effect on the attitudes and the feelings of the people involved; on the social arrangements that emerge among people; on the media; on the community; on parents. Impact must be defined very broadly in terms of both task and process, or product and process.

Some Closing Thoughts

Let me close by offering some closing thoughts.

We should look into places other than where we are used to looking for understandings about what should be done to institutionalize the dissemination process related to innovative programs. We have been socialized into thinking about the government as a source of funds. When the government as a source of funds dries up we should be looking to the private sector. That is, perhaps we should find ways to involve businesses in schooling and in what we are doing in dissemination. What springs to mind are some NDN projects that have been successful in persuading firms to pick up the costs of disseminating their innovative program that has relevance to that business. For instance, IBM may want to pick up programs with computer applications in education, or even doing some things that are not so directly related to their field of work, but which give them visibility, prestige--institutional public relations for themselves.

I think we in education also should learn from the political sphere. I am very interested that few people in education talk in terms of lobby groups, building constituencies, building coalitions, negotiating, identifying power bases, etc.--a whole vocabulary of how organizations in other sectors function. When we want to get support for good programs in schools, we now have to think about mobilizing grassroots support. We have to think about translating that grassroots support into votes, or their equivalent, in terms of putting pressures on people within bureaucracies. I think we have to put our attention into learning how to use those political strategies, and then using whichever seem applicable, both within our own organizations and in the dealing of our organizations with the outside world.

Marketing strategies and advertising have been mentioned. I think we are very remiss as disseminators in not understanding more about the dynamics of marketing and advertising. I think we, as an educational community, have sold ourselves short. We have not put our best foot forward. We have not claimed and substantiated the claims of the good work we are doing. I think David Crandall has taken absolutely the right pitch for this time and place, in his studies of dissemination efforts supporting school improvement. He says, in effect, "Listen folks, there are good schools out there, there is good stuff going on, and we are here to document it and tell you about all the good stuff happening, these are the factors that are making it happen. If you want to improve public education, it is really quite simple. This is what you have to do." Many of us have come out of research and teaching backgrounds. We may think that research knowledge is automatically power and that we don't have to package it in any way. We think we don't have to understand our audience in the same way that advertisers do in order to get our message across. For me, that's not true. I think we do have to package and know how to market, both within our own organizations and for the outside world. So, in addition to the new skills we need to acquire, we should also tap into and maybe use as consultants, people who know how to do it from other areas--politics, industry, marketing, advertising.

Most of us are either resource oriented or service oriented. We usually avoid empire bulding except when it happens by accident. We're novices but there is a lot of literature around, and I think one of the interesting things would be to develop that literature for our own consumption. I'm impressed, for instance, that within education evaluators don't often talk to disseminators and don't often talk to curriculum people. Only very recently in the field of evaluation is an organizational perspective being brought in. I think that is a microcosm for the larger problem, which is that we in education don't know a whole lot about what other sectors in our economy know. We should begin to find out. For instance, I know that the National Diffusion Network, which is very sensitive to the needs for staff development, have technical assistance providers who, at their last national conference, helped them to focus on lobbying techniques. How do the oil companies lobby? What do the medical associations do with lobbying? Closer to home, how do teachers' unions lobby? What can we learn from these groups about getting something to happen? We in educational dissemination should learn to build empires for something we think is worthwhile.

I think a lot of disseminators have problems being unambiguous about what they believe because education is such a complex and indeterminant enterprise. There is no large body of literature linking cause and effect between what is done in the classroom and what the learning outcomes are. There are too many intervening variables. This makes us somewhat reluctant to advocate a particular program or a particular teaching style. But we do believe in a process that is empowering teachers to make decisions that are reflective. We certainly should identify all the other things that we believe in without equivocation, then advocate them with all the skills we have or can acquire.

APPENDIX B

Notes from group meetings as reported

QUESTIONS AND ISSUES RAISED AS A RESULT OF READING THE SYNTHESIS

GROUP A - Dave Campbell, George Katagiri, Richard Port, Agnes McPhetres

Issue	1.	There is a need for linkage between decision makers and implementers.
ADDITIONAL HYPOTHESIS	2.	There is greater potential for institutionalization if the innovation fills a vacuum, addresses a need or provides a service not in competition with an existing program.
ADDITIONAL HYPOTHESIS	3.	Utilization of externally provided resources as support for moving the organization/school in the direction desired will enhance the potential for institutionalization.
ADDITIONAL HYPOTHESIS	4.	Maintenance of separate, visible projects is contrary to potential for institutionalization.
ADDITIONAL HYPOTHESIS	5.	a) Leadership doesn't need to be sold on the innovation in the early stages, but does need to provide the supportive climate which will allow a fair test of the innovation.
ISSUE		b) Therefore--we need to provide for an objective decision to be reached regarding leadership support.

GROUP B - Joe Pascarelli, Eula Ruby, Ted Lindley

ISSUE	1.	What do we do about identifying and latching on to existing practices or components when introducing innovations and/or change programs?
ISSUE	2.	Need to identify specific ways key administrators can behave to support institutionalizaton.
ISSUE	3.	What about the changing roles and functions of SEA/LEA project people when dissemination is no longer a federally guided, monitoring function?
ISSUE	4.	What are some ways in which cost sharing on the part of the client can occur to enhance institutionalization?
ISSUE	5.	The effect of NIE's limited expectations of SEAs (staff, line organization and thinking/support) when real change takes place.

ISSUE 6. Need to identify the roles/norms that have emerged since inception of ESEA Title Funding in 1965, as well as identify new roles/norms emerging in 1981 political climate.

GROUP C - Rene Pino, Kathleen Steffen, Jean Wieman, Maggie Rogers

CLARIFICATION 1. Clarify temporary--permanent systems

- What are factors working on a temporary systems
- How do you recognize the stages of transition from temporary to permanent status?

CLARIFICATION ELABORATION 2. How can you get a broad base of support when you have to be both flexible and adaptable? How do you maintain trust level and credibility?

DISCUSSION/ ELABORATION 3. What does it take to be flexible?

DISCUSSION/ ELABORATION 4. Next to last statement in list on page 10--who is doing it?

DISCUSSION 5. What about the apparent conflict between flexibility and credibility?

QUESTIONS RAISED DURING MORNING SESSION
and
BRAINSTORM SUGGESTIONS MADE DURING AFTERNOON SESSION

In response to a request to complete the following statements

"In the next six months.....", and
"I need to know how to....."

the following questions and statements were generated. The list of suggestions under some of the questions were generated later in the day.

1. How can I influence the Board of Education into accepting an idea?

   - establish a communication link--social, however else
   - identify high influence
   - test where they are
   - work with executive secretary--provide assistance
   - get ideas from minutes of Board meeting--indirectly fed into Board--proactive--give ideas
   - don't get on the agenda--prematurely
   - informal discussions with individuals
   - get tips from NWREL School Board project
   - be careful with design of presentations
   - use many visuals
   - work with State Association of School Boards
   - help them identify person to be liaison to your unit

2. To "firm up" a loose communication network of linkers that exist in the state (step to formalizing, cohesion, more life)

   - voluntary coalition--contracting on a voluntary basis--compact for staff development
   - maintain contact with networking literature
   - work at interorganizational arrangements
   - study the phenomena of "loosely coupled" systems
   - "Use it or lose it"
   - Check handbook Adrianne produced--check lists/guidelines
   - Sporadic
   - Polycephalic (sharing network with many centers of
   - I power--many-headed)
   - N
   - S
   - (S-P-I-N-S - Dave Clark)
   - identify people to be liaison person with the many special interest groups
   - pay close attention to the informal (share information - psychological support)

3. What can I do to bring about a supportive climate? The CSSO does it--what influence can I have? How can I be encouraging?

   - work with individual specialists to prepare special information packages
   - provide help for writing state plans
   - look at upcoming events - offer to help--offer services
   - route incoming information to proper people - let them know you are doing it--route slip-return for vertical file
   - others holding conferences--get DD thru with something on their field
   - create a role for client - two-way street
   - ask for help
   - ask for advice
   - appreciate people - dearth of "warm fuzzies"
   - always work through the specialist--specialize in collaboration

4. To continue to try to instill a proactive service mode of operation as opposed to a reactive, regulatory mode

   - may be alleviated by withdrawal of rules
   - an encapsulated--at the same time as being reactive, become proactive
   - provide support systems for a role change
   - use a third party to bear the brunt of some change
   - organizational attitude critical--is it a service attitude or a contract attitude?

5. I need to assure state funding for what we are currently doing with NIE/NDN funds (HEDDS)

6. How can I react to the inaction regarding lack of clarity about block grants and the role of the agency?

   - Lab trying to stay on top
   - People are hoarding knowledge--so share it more--pool available information

7. How concepts of marketing can be applied positively to dissemination activities, efforts, strategies

   - Talk more to marketing people
   - Make strong alliance with public information group
   - Be sure that what goes out looks good--package well
   - Investigate relative merits of kinds of media
   - Need to respect marketing enterprise

8. How can we show evidence of the institutionlization of the Dissemination Unit within NWREL projects?

9. How can we (NWREL Dissemination Unit) couple our implicit function as a Dissemination Unit with implicit dissemination functions of every program in the Lab?

10. How to identify and get the kinds of key leadership support needed in the 6 states and NWREL?

    - helps when lab involves CSSOs
    - enlarge the group of people who get a chance to increase their awareness
    - need regional stimulus
    - maybe the lab should be disseminating news about itself--strategies to accomplish

11. How can collaboration among agencies in the service of institutionalizing the dissemination function be improved?

12. How can I become credible so that people can ask for help? How institutionalize a process of giving and receiving help that is open and credible and business-like?

    - Be proactive before that can happen
    - Don't let things drag--create ongoing relationship
    - "Come through" with requests
    - Model networking--brokering getting people in touch with each other

13. Once we institutionalize--does that mean it's there forever? Issue--the terminus of institutionalization--is "fading out" good enough?

14. What is the ultimate we are after--a mission statement?

Implications and Next Steps

GROUP I - Joe Pascarelli, Kathleen Steffen, Agnes McPhetres, Eula Ruby, Richard Port

The synthesis document will be used as a tool to study ongoing institutionalization phenomena as follows:

1. Alaska

   requests the Regional Exchange to study its redirection process, document the ongoing history of the process, record what has been happening and develop a case study report.

2. Hawaii

   a. Will work with the Regional Exchange in studying the Principal's Project, using synthesis (and additional) hypotheses and the framework presented in the Pankratz document reviewed in the synthesis.

   b. Will make the synthesis available to the Office of Instructional Services for purposes of study to derive implications.

3. Northern Marianas Islands

   a. Will work with the Regional Exchange to use the Richard Port continuum and Pankratz chart (in synthesis) to document approaches to Math, Science, and Language Arts curriculum.

   b. Will work with the Regional Exchange to use the synthesis document with the Central Office of Curriculum Administration as a training tool.

GROUP II - Dave Campbell, Maggie Rogers

A. Implications for individual in NWREL Dissemination Services unit if it is to become institutionalized.

   1. Personal and group identity will change
   2. Rewards will be more intrinsic, less extrinsic
   3. Potential for long-term employment is increased

B. Implications for the NWREL Dissemination Services as a whole (as a group) if it is to become institutionalized.

1. It will be more convergent with organizational (NWREL) values.
2. Members of the unit will work more with NWREL staff than at or on staff.
3. Members of the unit will be viewed by the organization (staff of NWREL) as useful to them.
4. What members of the unit do will match other's expectations of what the function(s) of the unit should be.
5. Instutionalization of the unit has the potential of either increasing or decreasing use of the dissemination unit's services.

GROUP III - George Katagiri, Jean Wieman, Ted Lindley, Rene Pino

1. Oregon - will implement ideas for strengthening network and focus on securing fiscal support for dissemination activities (which are now included as a legitimate activity of the department).

2. Washington - will return and re-assess activities and plans in light of the synthesis.

3. Statements and Issues

a. What strategies must we devise to influence decision makers relative to realistic concepts about dissemination needs and services.

b. We need to do our "homework" about people we want to influence.

c. We need to take an empathetic role vis a vis the people we impact--aim toward a "win-win" outcome.

APPENDIX C

Clarification of some terms
as requested by some members of the Advisory Board

PERMANENT AND TEMPORARY SYSTEMS

Permanent Systems

Systems that are generally perceived as not time-bound.
Systems that will persist over time, although there may be (probably will be) internal changes and reorganizations to meet requirements of the time.

Examples of permanent systems include:

- State Departments of Education
- School Districts
- School buildings (although from time to time a particular school building may be closed)
- Governments (national, state, local)
- Standing committees within systems
- Churches

Temporary Systems

Systems that are perceived as having a definite beginning-ending time frame. They are usually formed to perform a specific, well-defined task. They are frequently bound by funding availability. They may become a part of or a function of a permanent system, at which point they are perceived as a permanent- not temporary-system.

Examples of temporary systems include:

- Funded projects with a definite time frame
- Ad hoc committees
- Task forces
- Experimental projects
- New practices and programs

Transition from temporary to permanent system status includes:

- Accurate identification and acceptance as a regular feature by ongoing members of the organization and by knowledgeable clients
- Endorsement and promotion by both formal and informal influencers in the system
- Appropriate revision of the structure of the system
- Provision for support in the allocation of regular resources
- Pervasive, routine participation in the practice or use of the product by appropriate persons in the organization